

against me, we can expand the list. How about the final report of the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration effort, a comprehensive analysis mandated in Public Law, an emergency appropriations bill after Hurricane Katrina? It was due in December 2007. It is not finished. It is not delayed because of the State of Louisiana. It is delayed because of the corps.

I know Senator DORGAN is anxious for a promotion of the corps leadership. I have to say, I am anxious for this critical report that was due in December 2007. We haven't seen it.

Is that not good enough? How about the Louisiana Water Resources Council I talked about? That was mandated in the 2007 WRDA bill. The corps has not produced it yet. It wasn't just authorized; it was mandated. It is not up and running. Senator DORGAN is anxious for a promotion for the pristine corps leadership. I am anxious for that.

How about the establishment of a Coastal Louisiana Ecosystem Protection and Restoration Task Force? That was mandated in the 2007 WRDA. We haven't seen that yet. The integration team under that task force was a separate team mandated in the 2007 WRDA, 3 years ago. Nowhere to be seen. That is not being held up by the State. That is the corps. Clear authorization, clear mandate, nowhere to be seen.

How about a comprehensive plan for protecting and preserving the Louisiana coast? That was due in November 2008. That was mandated in the 2007 WRDA. It is not being held up by the State, but it is nowhere to be seen. Senator DORGAN is anxious for promotion for the pristine corps leadership. I am anxious for this important work to protect Louisiana citizens.

That is not the whole list. How about the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet Ecosystem Restoration Plan? That was due in May of 2008. We haven't seen it. It has not been submitted. It is a corps report, not a State of Louisiana report. Nowhere to be seen.

How about section 707 of the WRDA? That actually mandates that the State can get credit from one project and it can be transferred to another project. It is in clear language. The corps says they are not going to do it. You want clear authorization? We have it. The corps is ignoring it.

How about section 7006 in the same 2007 WRDA. That requires that five construction reports be submitted to Congress to move forward with key projects authorized in that WRDA, five critical projects. They are authorized in the WRDA bill. They can't move forward until those construction reports are submitted by the corps.

We have not seen the first thing of any of those five reports. The State is not holding them up. We are waiting on the corps. The distinguished Senator is anxious about a promotion for the pristine corps leadership. Well, great. I am anxious to see that mandated report.

We can go on and on. The point is—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my colleague from Louisiana describes me as anxious. I will tell you what I am anxious about. I am anxious to have a Member of this Senate stop using a U.S. soldier and the promotion of a soldier as a pawn to meet certain demands. I am anxious never to see that happen again.

We are talking about a soldier who has served in wartime, has served 30 years, who, 6 months ago, was supposed to have been promoted by a unanimous vote of the Armed Services Committee under the leadership of CARL LEVIN and JOHN MCCAIN. Six months later, that soldier's career is on hold because of one Senator.

I wish to say this. I think it was Will Rogers who said: It is not what he says that bothers me. It is what he says he knows for sure that just ain't so. I have just heard the most unbelievable amount of fiction on this floor. Let me describe some of it. My colleague has just gone through a tortured lesson in the most unbelievable interpretation of the authority and the law with respect to the Corps of Engineers.

I said when I started today that we have put \$14 billion into New Orleans and Louisiana. I have been proud to be a part of that as chairman of the subcommittee on Appropriations that actually funds these issues—\$14 billion. But I will say to my colleague, my colleague is fast wearing out his welcome with me and I expect the Corps of Engineers with this kind of behavior.

I do not normally do this personally, but I tell you what, when a soldier serves his country and then my colleague says to that soldier: I am not going to allow you to be promoted until the Corps of Engineers does what I demand, when, in fact, the Corps of Engineers cannot legally do what he demands, then I say that is using a soldier's promotion as a pawn, and I think that is unbelievably awful to do.

I wish to say this. My colleague described—in fact, he said I was using information the corps feeds me. He went into a whole series of pieces of language, suggesting we have all swallowed the minnow somehow.

Let me say this. On the first item my colleague raised, he forgot to make one important point. He said: I demand they do this. That is the first issue of his letter to the Corps of Engineers—the outfall canals and pump to the river. I demand they do this, he said. Well, they cannot do that, actually. What he is proposing, by the way, for his State and his city is to spend more money for less flood protection. That is what he is proposing.

The corps will not do it, and I will tell you why. He knows why, but he

would not tell the rest of the folks here. But we actually had a vote on that in the Senate Appropriations Committee. Guess how that vote came out. The majority of the Democrats and the Republicans on the Appropriations Committee said: We do not intend to spend more money for less flood control protection. We do not intend to do that. We voted no. It is just one little piece of information my colleague left out on the floor of the Senate. Convenient perhaps, but, nonetheless, he left it out.

I am not going to go through this. We have the majority leader and the minority leader on the floor. But I offered, as a courtesy, to tell the Senator from Louisiana when I was coming to the floor today. He did not extend the same courtesy to me when I asked him to yield so I could make a point about the vote, so I will not be extending that courtesy in the future.

I am going to come to the floor again on a unanimous consent request saying: Let's have one person in this Senate stop using the promotion of a dedicated, decorated, American soldier as a pawn in order to meet demands that the Corps of Engineers cannot meet. My colleague seems to think somehow that the Corps of Engineers is something, an organization without merit. I will say this to him: There are plenty of things wrong with, I suppose, every government agency and every government organization.

But I will say this. If you know much about the Corps of Engineers, you are not going to want to be in a big flood fight without them as a partner. Oh, they have made mistakes, I tell you. But nobody has had more floods than we have had in North Dakota, I expect, over a long period of time, and I wish to see the corps as a partner in the flood fight because they are good. They know what they are doing.

Yes, they have made mistakes. But when my colleague comes to the floor of the Senate and says there are 14 reports, the Corps of Engineers blew it—14 reports—they cannot meet any deadlines, he does not tell the rest of the story. I went and checked on those 14 reports. Let me describe 10 of them. I will not describe the other four because it would take some time. But for 10 of the reports the deadline was not met on, it was because the reports required there be the execution of a feasibility cost-sharing agreement with the State of Louisiana, and at the request of the State of Louisiana, the corps did not execute the agreement until June of 2009.

So my colleague criticizes the Corps of Engineers, calls them a bunch of elitists. He says they miss all these deadlines. Well, at least on 10 of the deadlines the State of Louisiana asked them not to proceed with respect to that agreement until June of 2009. That is fundamentally unfair—fundamentally unfair.

With respect to Morganza to the gulf—and I could go through a whole